

WORKMAN NYDEGGER
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84111
TELEPHONE (801) 533-9800
FAX (801) 328-1707

TELECOPIER COVER SHEET

September 11, 2009

Total Number of Pages
(including cover letter): 13 pages

Please deliver the transmitted facsimile pages to:

Examiner Zheng Wei

Phone: (571) 270-1059

Fax: (571) 270-2059

From: **Brian D. Tucker**

Comments: Please see the attached interview issues to be discussed
Wednesday, September 16, 2009 at 11:00am

Serial No. 10/802,239

Docket No. 13768.1375

We are transmitting from a Sharp FO-750 or Sharp FO-6100 facsimile machine. If you do not receive all the pages or they are unreadable, please contact me as soon as possible at (801) 533-9800.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE TO DELIVER IT TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE, AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

AHY0000000637V001

VIA eFILE

PATENT APPLICATION
Docket No. 13768.1375

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of)
	Alex A. Kipman)
)
Serial No.:	10/802,239) Art Unit
) 2192
Filed:	March 17, 2004)
)
Conf. No.:	5256)
)
For:	ARCHITECTURE THAT RESTRICTS)
	PERMISSIONS GRANTED TO A BUILD)
	PROCESS)
)
Examiner:	Zheng Wei)
)
Customer No.:	47973)

AMENDMENT "F" AND RESPONSE AFTER NON-FINAL

VIA eFILE AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the NON-FINAL Office action of July 21, 2009 (paper no. 20090714), please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 9 of this paper.

Application No. 10/802,239
Amendment "F" dated _____
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. (Previously Presented) A system that facilitates management of a build process, comprising:

a build process processor that processes one or more build entities; and

a policy component that is processed by the build process processor to determine one or more levels of trust within which the build process operates;

wherein a developer associates the one or more build entities with one or more levels of trust, such that at build time, a principal permission level under which the build process executes is determined by analyzing the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities, and lowest level of trust of all involved build entities dictates the principal permission level for execution of the build process; and

wherein the levels of trust include:

(i) levels that are representative of trusted, which has no restrictions to the build process,

(ii) semi-trusted, which has restrictions to the build process and

(iii) untrusted, which causes the build process to fail,

wherein if the lowest level of trust is untrusted and the build process fails, the developer is notified.

2. (Canceled)

3. (Original) The system of claim 1, the policy component includes one or more policy files that are processed by the build process.

4. (Original) The system of claim 1, the policy component includes one or more policy files that are processed by the build process before the one or more build entities are built.

Application No. 10/802,239

Amendment "F" dated _____

Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

5. (Original) The system of claim 1, the one or more entities include at least one of a project, a task, a logger, and operating system (OS) account information.

6. (Original) The system of claim 1, at least one of the one or more build entities are each associated with the one or more of the levels of trust, which associations are defined in the policy component via at least one of a user-definable policy file and a default policy file, at least one or both of which are processed to determine the level of trust for the build process.

7. (Canceled)

8. (Original) A computer that employs the system of claim 1.

9. (Original) A server that employs the system of claim 1.

10. (Original) The system of claim 1, the entity is received at least by one of downloading from a website, as part of an e-mail, and a version control system.

Application No. 10/802,239

Amendment "F" dated _____

Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

11. (Previously Presented) A system that facilitates management of a build process, comprising:

a build process processor that processes one or more build entities; and

one or more policy files that are processed by the build process processor to determine a permission level within which the build process operates;

wherein a developer associates the one or more build entities with one or more levels of trust, such that at build time, a principal permission level under which the build process executes is determined by analyzing the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities, and lowest level of trust of all involved build entities dictates the principal permission level for execution of the build process; and

wherein the levels of trust include:

(i) levels that are representative of trusted, which has no restrictions to the build process,

(ii) semi-trusted, which has restrictions to the build process and

(iii) untrusted, which causes the build process to fail,

wherein if the lowest level of trust is untrusted and the build process fails, the developer is notified.

12. (Original) The system of claim 11, the permission level is based on a level of trust associated with a corresponding entity of the one or more entities.

13. (Original) The system of claim 11, the one or more policy files are all processed against the one or more build entities before the build process builds the one or more build entities.

14. (Original) The system of claim 11, the one or more policy files each include an association of an entity with at least one level of trust.

15. (Original) The system of claim 11, the one or more entities include at least one of a project, a task, a logger, and operating system (OS) account information.

Application No. 10/802,239

Amendment "F" dated _____

Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

16. (Original) The system of claim 11, the build process fails to build the one or more build entities when the permission level is representative of un trusted.

17. (Canceled)

18. (Original) The system of claim 11, the one or more policy files are written in XML.

19. (Original) The system of claim 11, the one or more policy files are adjusted automatically according to one or more parameters.

Application No. 10/802,239

Amendment "F" dated _____

Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

20. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method for managing a build process, the method comprising:

receiving a build process for building one or more build entities;

associating the one or more build entities with a level of trust, wherein the levels of trust include:

- (i) allowing any operation to be performed,
- (ii) allowing only a minimal set of operations to be performed and
- (iii) aborting the build process,

determining a principal permission level under which the build process executes by analyzing the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities;

performing the build process at the lowest level of trust of all involved build entities; and if the lowest level of trust is aborting the build process, then notifying a user that the build process failed.

21. (Canceled)

22. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium ~~method~~ of claim 20, further comprising sending a message when the build process fails.

23. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium ~~method~~ of claim 20, further comprising providing a level of trust that allows any operation to be performed during the act of performing.

24. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium ~~method~~ of claim 20, further comprising providing a level of trust that allows only a minimal set of operations to be performed during the act of performing.

25. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium ~~method~~ of claim 20, further comprising providing a level of trust that aborts the build process during the act of performing.

Application No. 10/802,239

Amendment "F" dated _____

Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

26. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium method of claim 20, the act of associating associates one of the one or more build entities with at least two levels of trust.

27. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium method of claim 20, further comprising providing a default set of associations between the one or more build entities and one or more levels of trust in the form of a file.

28. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium method of claim 20, the level of trust is defined according to at least one of user-defined policy data and default policy data.

29. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium method of claim 28, the user-defined policy data overrides the default data where a conflict occurs.

30. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium method of claim 20, further comprising storing the association of the build entity with the level of trust in the form of a file to which access is restricted.

31. (Currently Amended) The computer storage medium method of claim 20, further comprising storing the association of the build entity with the level of trust in the form of a file that further relates the use of system resources with the level of trust.

Application No. 10/802,239

Amendment "F" dated _____

Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

32. (Previously Presented) A system that facilitates control of a build process, comprising:

means for providing an association between one or more build entities and a level of trust, wherein the levels of trust include:

- (i) allowing any operation to be performed,
- (ii) allowing only a minimal set of operations to be performed and
- (iii) aborting the build process,

means for determining a principal permission level under which the build process executes by analyzing the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities;

means for performing the build process at the lowest level of trust of all involved build entities used during the build process; and

if the lowest level of trust is aborting the build process, then means for notifying a user that the build process failed.

33. (Original) The system of claim 32, further comprising means for storing the association in the format of a file.

34. (Original) The system of claim 32, further comprising means for applying the association against new build entities before the build process completes.

35. (Original) The system of claim 32, further comprising means for automatically associating a level of trust with a new build entity.

36. (Canceled)

Application No. 10/802,239
Amendment "F" dated _____
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009 considered claims 1, 3-6, 8-16, 18-20, and 22-35 each of which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as being unpatentable over Cynerman and Jerger (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,321,334).¹

By this response, claims 20 and 22-31 have been amended so that they are directed to a computer storage medium which does not encompass signals. Claims 22-31 had been erroneously directed to methods.

Traversal of the Prior Art Rejections

The present invention is directed to limiting what an entity (e.g. project files) has access to while it is being built. In other words, the present invention defines a trust level under which the build process will be executed. The specification describes a build process and how the build process's permissions are affected by the entities involved in the build. A build process as described in the specification, therefore, refers to the process of building a software entity (e.g. an application, executable, etc.). As such, a build process could encompass compiling code, linking libraries, etc. Therefore, the claims are directed to defining a permission level under which the build process will perform these actions.

For example, as claimed in claim 1, a system including a build process processor processes one or more build entities. This processing should be construed to encompass compiling, linking, and the like. Before the build process is processed, a policy component is accessed to determine what trust level the build process will be processed with. Each build entity that is being processed as part of the build process has an associated trust level assigned to it. The trust level of the build entity with the lowest trust level is used as the trust level for the build process. Each of the independent claims contains similar limitations as claim 1.

The Cynerman reference describes a scripting tool (Ant) that automates the build process. It is emphasized that Ant is not a build process. Ant simply provides a way to automate the build process that is performed by calling executables using a command prompt. For example, under the heading "What is Ant?" on page 1, Cynerman describes Ant as "a platform-

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Application No. 10/802,239
Amendment "F" dated _____
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

independent scripting tool that lets you construct your build scripts in much the same fashion as the 'make' tool in C or C++." As a scripting tool, Ant runs specified commands using a command prompt. The commands are specified using the target element. The example on page 3 under the title "Simple build process with Ant (simple.xml)" illustrates various targets including init, clean, prepare, compile, and deploy. Ant simply allows a programmer to specify what commands should be run with what parameters using a single XML file. Ant executes these commands as specified. However, the actual building occurs by invoking other executables (e.g. the same functionality can be performed by manually entering the commands in the command prompt. Ant simply stores these commands in an XML file providing for consistency across builds). For example, in order to use Ant, the Java Development Kit (JDK) must also be installed on the system. This is because the executables within the JDK actually perform the build. See Pg. 2, "What do I need to use Ant?". Because Ant is not a build process, it cannot teach or suggest any of the limitations of the independent claims. Further, Cymerman makes no mention of accessing a policy to apply a permission level to the build process.

Jerger also does not describe accessing a policy to apply a permission level to the build process. Jerger discloses embodiments for setting permissions for web content based on where the content is retrieved. This is similar to the features provided in current versions of Internet Explorer under the Security tab in the Internet Options window. Specifying permission levels for web content is not similar to specifying permissions for a build process. In particular, the claims specifically state that the level of trust is determined based on the lowest level of trust assigned to a build entity involved in the build process. There is nothing similar to this in either reference.

With specific reference to the limitations of claim 1, neither reference discloses "a policy component that is processed by the build process processor to determine one or more levels of trust within which the build process operates." As addressed above, Ant is not a build process. The only build process that could be implied in either reference would be the executables that are listed within the target element in Ant. However, Cymerman discloses nothing about these build processes other than that they are called by Ant. Nothing in Ant specifies a level of trust to be applied to the build process. Further, Applicant submits that the examiner's combination of Cymerman with Jerger is unreasonable primarily because Cymerman only tangentially addresses build processes and Jerger has nothing to do with build processes. Finally, the examiner has

Application No. 10/802,239
Amendment "F" dated _____
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

failed to provide a valid reason for combining the teachings of the two references. The stated reason is that "one would have been motivated to do so to secure the build process by automatically administering the decision to grant or deny permissions to specific build entities...." This motivation is improper because Ant is not a build process within a reasonable interpretation of the claims. Therefore, modifying Ant with the teachings of Jerger still would not secure the build process since Ant only invokes the executables that perform the build process rather than playing a role during the build process.

Claim 1 also recites that "at build time, a principal permission level under which the build process executes is determined by analyzing the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities, and lowest level of trust of all involved build entities dictates the principal permission level for execution of the build process." Neither reference discloses or suggests this limitation. Jerger does not analyze the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities. In Jerger, permissions are set for an individual file. For example, when a file downloaded from a website wants to run, a permission level is assigned to the file based on what website it is from. There is no determination of which entity has the lowest level of trust because there is only a single entity – the file. Further, in the present invention, the permission level is assigned to the build process based on the level of trust of each build entity. The only possible analogy that can be made in Jerger is to equate the website with the build entity and the file with the build process. Applicant submits, however, that this is a very unreasonable analogy. The build process processes the build entities to create some type of software entity (e.g. an executable). In contrast, the file (which is equated with the build process in this analogy) is itself executed. The file cannot perform any processing on the website. Therefore, this analogy fails. As such, Jerger cannot teach or suggest these limitations. Further, because Cymerman does not address a build process, it cannot be combined with Jerger to show obviousness.

In summary, Applicant submits that the combination of Cymerman and Jerger fails to teach or suggest each limitation of the independent claims. Therefore, the claims are novel and non-obvious in view of the current art.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending

Application No. 10/802,239

Amendment "F" dated _____

Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009

application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this ____ day of _____, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
BRIAN D. TUCKER
Registration No. 61,550
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:BDT
2477838_1